



Nathan Schumaker <[REDACTED]>

one more clarification

2 messages

Brian_Woodbridge@fws.gov <Brian_Woodbridge@fws.gov>

Tue, May 18, 2010 at 9:15 AM

To: Nathan Schumaker <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Brendan White <Brendan_White@fws.gov>, "Bruce G. Marcot" <brucem@spiritone.com>, Dave LaPlante <dave@nrg-gis.com>

Hi all;

Following yesterday's call, Dave came away with the task of converting the data in the MaxEnt layer into two types:

- 1) Exclusion areas- places not considered- such as ocean, Puget Sound
- 2) Pixels with no habitat value (=0) which includes MaxEnt-estimated zeros AND the 'no data' masks applied to GNN (high elevation, oak woodland, agricultural, urban, etc).

There was some mention of "snow-covered peaks" as exclusion areas.... right now they are lumped in with the zeros. If there is a high-elevation cutoff that should be an excluded area, we need to determine that elevation for Dave (and it would shift latitudinally). Shall we leave it as a zero?

thanks

bw

Brian Woodbridge
Northern Spotted Owl Recovery
Chair, Klamath Province Working Group
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office
vox: (530) 841-3101
fax: (530) 842-4517
cell: (530) 340-3591

Nathan Schumaker <[REDACTED]>

Tue, May 18, 2010 at 9:25 AM

To: Brian_Woodbridge@fws.gov

Cc: Brendan White <Brendan_White@fws.gov>, "Bruce G. Marcot" <brucem@spiritone.com>, Dave LaPlante <dave@nrg-gis.com>

I'll defer to others on the snow-covered peaks issue. Otherwise, I agree with items 1 and 2 completely.

Item 3 would be a bitmap showing all of the provinces, with each province being assigned to a single unique index.

Item 4 would be a bitmap showing all of the DSAs, with each DSA being assigned to a single unique index.

Thanks,

Nathan

5/18/2010

Gmail - one more clarification

[Quoted text hidden]

—

Nathan Schumaker

[REDACTED]

(541) 754-4658
